

Sinclair
Broadcasting's
decision to force
their stations to
air an anti-Kerry
documentary days
before the election
is a clear example
of the dangers of
media consolidation.
Furthermore, it is
not the first time
that Sinclair
Broadcasting has
manipulated the flow
of information in
order to influence
public opinion on
behalf of the Bush
administration.

Sinclair uses the
public airwaves free
of charge, and is
obligated by law to
serve the public
interest. But when
large companies
control the
airwaves, we get
more of what's good
for the bottom line
and less of what we
need for our
democracy. Instead
of something
produced at "News
Central" far away,
it's more important
that we see real
people from our own
communities and more
substantive news
about issues that
matter. It appears
to stretch credulity
to the breaking
point and beyond to
contend, as the
mouthpiece for SB
recently said to a
group of AP
reporters, that any
of this toxic
twaddle qualifies in
any way as "news".
SB works for Shrub;

his job is to help
Shrub get elected by
dredging up a load
of silly and
long-discredited
slanders and give
them as wide a
public exposure as
possible. Alas, for
anyone who has been
awake during this
election cycle,
there's no news
here.

It is well past the
time for corrective
action; it is my
hope that someone
will try to do the
right thing in this
case. That will
require some sort of
penalty to attach to
such transparently
phony attempts to
evade the strictures
of our election laws
with this free
pro-shrub propaganda
blitz.

Sinclair's actions
show why we need to
strengthen media
ownership rules, not
weaken them. They
show why the license
renewal process
needs to involve
more than a returned
postcard. Thank you.

Ivan Weinell, Ph.D.